

COLO-HEP-540

Heterotic Strings on Generalized Calabi-Yau Manifolds and Kaehler Moduli Stabilization

S. P. de Alwis[†]

Physics Department, University of Colorado,
Boulder, CO 80309 USA

Abstract

Compactifications of heterotic string theory on Generalized Calabi-Yau manifolds have been expected to give the same type of flexibility that type IIB compactifications on Calabi-Yau orientifolds have. In this note we generalize the work done on half-flat manifolds by other authors, to show how flux quantization occurs in the general case, by starting with a basis of harmonic forms and then extending it. However it turns out that only the axions associated with the non-harmonic directions in the space of Kaehler moduli, can be stabilized by the geometric (torsion) terms. Also we argue that there are no supersymmetric extrema of the potential when the second (and fourth) cohomology groups on the manifold are non-trivial. We suggest that threshold corrections to the classical gauge coupling function could solve these problems.

[†] e-mail: dealwiss@colorado.edu

I. INTRODUCTION

Most of the recent work on flux compactifications of string theory has focused on type IIB on Calabi-Yau (CY) orientifolds (see [1, 2] for reviews). However it is far more difficult to get the standard model (or the MSSM) there than it is to get it in Heterotic compactifications. The principal reason is chirality which in Heterotic theory can actually be obtained quite easily, while in type IIB this requires somewhat elaborate constructions. Getting a Grand Unified Theory (GUT) is even more difficult in the IIB context.

On the other hand in type IIB on CY orientifolds one can turn on two types of fluxes; NS-NS (H-flux) and RR to stabilize (after including also non-perturbative terms) all (closed string) moduli as well as the dilaton. The existence of two types of fluxes gives enough fine-tuning freedom, that it is easy to see that there would be many models that can have the dilaton stabilized at an acceptable value, a gravitino mass many orders of magnitude below the Planck scale (if one wants low energy supersymmetry (SUSY)), and a zero (or highly suppressed value) for the cosmological constant (CC).

However in the Heterotic string compactified on CY one can only turn on one type of flux, namely H-flux, and even with non-perturbative terms (which are in fact necessary to stabilize the dilaton) one cannot stabilize the Kaehler moduli - in fact one has a no-scale model. Furthermore, typically the dilaton will be stabilized in the strong coupling regime. One can introduce threshold corrections to these non-perturbative corrections to stabilize the Kaehler moduli, but then of course one needs to tune the cosmological constant to an acceptable value and it is not clear that one has enough freedom to do so.

It has been suggested that these problems can be overcome by compactifying the heterotic string on generalized Calabi-Yau manifolds [3][4] (for earlier work see [5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10]). Much of this work has been in the context of so-called half-flat manifolds. In constructing the potential for the moduli in these works a basis of forms is introduced that is not harmonic, and it is not clear how this could still result in a potential for the moduli that is determined in terms of integer flux parameters. Nevertheless as shown in [3] this quantization condition still holds for all but one parameter. However even this appeared to be difficult to establish for generalized (non-half-flat) CY manifolds. In this paper we show that by a judicious choice of basis forms it is possible to show the quantization of the flux parameters, but it is still unclear how to show the quantization of parameters corresponding to the torsion of the

manifold. We also show that if the cohomology groups H^2/H^4 are non-trivial then there is no supersymmetric solution even for generalized CY manifolds. What happens is that the SUSY equations for the corresponding Kaehler moduli have no solution. There is no obstruction, as far as we can see, to finding non-supersymmetric solutions, but even when there are such stable points, the axions corresponding to those Kaehler moduli will be flat directions in the potential just as in the case of half-flat manifolds [3].

II. CONSTRUCTING A BASIS

Let $\hat{Y}$ be a generalized Calabi-Yau (CY) manifold obtained by deforming a Calabi-Yau manifold Y whose cohomology groups $H^3(Y)$ and $H^2/H^4(Y)$ have dimensions $2b_3 \equiv 2(h_{12} + 1)$ and $b_2 = b_4 = h_{11}$ respectively. As with the underlying CY manifold Y there is a globally defined real two form J and a globally defined complex three form Ω in $\hat{Y}$, but unlike in Y on $\hat{Y}$, $dJ \neq 0$, and $d\Omega \neq 0$. So the dimensions of the cohomology groups $H^3(\hat{Y}), H^2/H^4(\hat{Y})$ are such that $\hat{b}_3 < b_3$, $\hat{b}_2 < b_2$. A basis of harmonic forms for $H^3(\hat{Y})$ is

$$\alpha_a, \beta^a; a = 1, 2, \dots, \hat{b}_3 \equiv \hat{h}_{21} + 1, \quad (1)$$

and for H^2/H^4

$$\omega_i, \tilde{\omega}^i; i = 1, 2, \dots, \hat{b}_2 = \hat{b}_4 \equiv \hat{h}_{11}. \quad (2)$$

These satisfy the usual relations for a harmonic basis,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\hat{Y}} \alpha_a \wedge \beta^b &= \int_{A^b} \alpha_a = \int_{B^b} \beta^b = \delta_a^b, \\ \int_{\hat{Y}} \alpha_a \wedge \alpha_b &= \int_{\hat{Y}} \beta^a \wedge \beta^b = \int_{B^b} \alpha_a = \int_{A^a} \beta^b = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Here $A^a(B_a)$ are three cycles dual to $\beta^a(\alpha_a)$. Also

$$\int_{\hat{Y}} \omega_i \wedge \tilde{\omega}^j = \int_{C_2^j} \omega_i = \int_{C_4^i} \tilde{\omega}^j = \delta_i^j, \quad (4)$$

where $C_2^j(C_4^i)$ are cycles dual to $\tilde{\omega}^j(\omega_i)$. Henceforth all integrals without a subscript will be taken over the whole manifold $\hat{Y}$. Note that in this section we have chosen units such that $2\pi\sqrt{\alpha'} = 1$.

Now as remarked earlier, on $\hat{Y}$

$$dJ \neq 0, d\Omega \neq 0. \quad (5)$$

Clearly because of (5) J and Ω cannot be expanded in the above harmonic basis. We need to append to this basis additional two/four forms and three forms

$$\omega_\kappa, \tilde{\omega}^\kappa, \kappa = \hat{b}_2 + 1, \dots, b_2; \alpha_\gamma, \beta^\gamma, \gamma = \hat{b}_3 + 1, \dots, b_3.$$

These are neither closed nor co-closed and may be written as

$$\omega_\kappa = \delta\omega_{\kappa(3)} + d\omega_{\kappa(2)}, \tilde{\omega}^\kappa = \delta\omega_{(5)}^\kappa + d\omega_{(3)}^\kappa; \alpha_\gamma = \delta\alpha_{\gamma(4)} + d\alpha_{\gamma(2)}, \beta^\gamma = \delta\beta_{(4)}^\gamma + d\beta_{(2)}^\gamma. \quad (6)$$

They can be taken to satisfy the relations

$$\int \alpha_\gamma \wedge \beta^a = \int \alpha_\gamma \wedge \alpha_a = \int \alpha_a \wedge \beta^\gamma = \int \beta^\gamma \wedge \beta^a = 0, \int \alpha_\gamma \wedge \beta^\delta = \delta_\gamma^\delta, \quad (7)$$

$$\int \omega_\kappa \wedge \tilde{\omega}^i = \int \omega_i \wedge \tilde{\omega}^\kappa = 0, \int \omega_\kappa \wedge \tilde{\omega}^\lambda = \delta_\kappa^\lambda. \quad (8)$$

Note that in the above we have made the usual assumption common in the physics literature (see for example section 3 of [11]) that these generalized manifolds are closely related to the CY manifold of which it is a generalization, so that there is a finite basis of forms in which J and Ω can be expanded in, that is related to the harmonic basis of the corresponding CY. Combining equations (3)(4)(7)(8) we may write

$$\int \alpha_A \wedge \beta^B = \delta_A^B, \int \alpha_A \wedge \alpha_B = \int \beta^A \wedge \beta^B = 0, A, B = 1, \dots, b_3, \quad (9)$$

$$\int \omega_I \wedge \tilde{\omega}^J = \delta_I^J, I, J = 1, \dots, b_2. \quad (10)$$

Note however there is no analog of the integrals over 3, 2 and 4-cycles as in equations(3)(4) for these additional forms which are not harmonic.

Expanding the globally defined complex three form Ω in terms of the basis three forms we have,

$$\Omega = Z^A \alpha_A - G_A \beta^A, \quad (11)$$

where in the related CY manifold Y the Z^A would be homogeneous (complex) coordinates on the space of complex structures and $G_A = \frac{\partial G}{\partial Z^A}$, with $G(Z^A)$ being a homogeneous function of degree two.

Similarly the globally defined two form J may be expanded in our basis two forms as

$$J = t^I \omega_I = t^i \omega_i + t^\kappa \omega_\kappa, \quad (12)$$

where t^I would be the set of Kaehler moduli of the underlying CY manifold Y . Now we have, expanding in terms of our basis three forms,

$$d\omega_\kappa = p_{\kappa A}\beta^A - q_\kappa^A\alpha_A.$$

Using the ortho-normality relations (9) (10) and the harmonicity of α_a, β^a we have

$$p_{\kappa a} = \int_{\hat{Y}} \alpha_a \wedge d\omega_\kappa = 0, \quad q_\kappa^a = \int_{\hat{Y}} \beta^a \wedge d\omega_\kappa = 0.$$

So

$$d\omega_\kappa = p_{\kappa\gamma}\beta^\gamma - q_\kappa^\gamma\alpha_\gamma. \quad (13)$$

Thus we get

$$dJ = t^I d\omega_I = t^\kappa d\omega_\kappa = \sum_{\kappa=\hat{b}_2+1}^{b_2} t^\kappa (p_{\kappa\gamma}\beta^\gamma - q_\kappa^\gamma\alpha_\gamma). \quad (14)$$

III. QUANTIZATION OF H-FLUX

Now we can expand H flux in terms of the basis three forms [13]:

$$H_{flux} = \frac{1}{6\sqrt{8}}(\mu^A\alpha_A - \epsilon_A\beta^A) \quad (15)$$

If we work to lowest order in the α' expansion and ignore the Green-Schwarz (GS) term (or take the standard embedding of the tangent bundle connection in the gauge connection) we have $dH_{flux} = 0$. The flux must also satisfy the equation of motion $d * H_{flux} = 0$ (again ignoring the GS term) i.e. H_{flux} is harmonic. So the expansion in (15) runs only over the harmonic part of the basis:

$$H_{flux} = \frac{1}{6\sqrt{8}}(\mu^a\alpha_a - \epsilon_a\beta^a) \quad (16)$$

Now since α_a, β^a are harmonic we have (see (3)) after restoring the string scale,

$$\int_{A^b} \alpha_a = \int_{B_a} \beta^b = (2\pi\sqrt{\alpha'})^3 \delta_b^a. \quad (17)$$

Using the relations (9) (which now acquire a factor $(2\pi\sqrt{\alpha'})^6$ on the RHS) we have (since $dH = 0$)

$$(2\pi\sqrt{\alpha'})^3 \int_{A^a} H = \int H \wedge \beta^a = \frac{1}{6\sqrt{8}} \mu^a (2\pi\sqrt{\alpha'})^6. \quad (18)$$

The first equation above is Poincare duality and the second follows from (15) and the orthonormality relations (9). Quantization of H-flux (coming from it being sourced by strings) implies

$$\int_{C_3} H = (2\pi\sqrt{\alpha'})^2 n, \quad n \in \mathcal{Z}. \quad (19)$$

Thus we have from (18) and a similar equation involving an B^a cycle and its associated dual form α_a ,

$$\mu^a = \frac{6\sqrt{2}}{\pi\sqrt{\alpha'}} n_A^a, \quad \epsilon_a = \frac{6\sqrt{2}}{\pi\sqrt{\alpha'}} n_{Ba}^a; \quad n_A^a, n_{Ba}^a \in \mathcal{Z}. \quad (20)$$

IV. STABILIZATION OF KAEHLER MODULI

The Kaehler potential of the theory is given by

$$K = -\ln(S + \bar{S}) - \ln(8\mathcal{K}) - \ln(8\tilde{\mathcal{K}})$$

where

$$\mathcal{K} = d_{IJK} t^I t^J t^K \quad (21)$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{K}} = \sum_1^{h_{12}} \tilde{d}_{abc} z^a z^b z^c \quad (22)$$

where t^I are the Kaehler moduli and z^a are the (real parts of) the complex structure moduli and $d_{IJK}, \tilde{d}_{abc}$ are intersection numbers for the 2 cycles on the manifold and its mirror. The holomorphic coordinates on the two moduli spaces are $T = t^i + i\tau^i$ and $Z^a = z^a + i\zeta^a$. Also we write $S = s + i\sigma$ so that the real fields s, σ are respectively the model independent dilaton and axion of the heterotic string.

The GTVW superpotential of this theory is (see [3] and references therein)

$$\mathcal{W} = \int \Omega \wedge (H + idJ) \quad (23)$$

From (11) and (14) we have

$$\int \Omega \wedge idJ = i(Z^\gamma p_{\kappa\gamma} - G_\gamma(Z) q_\kappa^\gamma) t^\kappa$$

The field strength $H = dB + H_{flux}$, where we may expand the two form field in terms of our basis two forms $B = -\tau^I \omega_I$, where the τ^I are the model dependent axions of the

underlying string theory. So ignoring the 4D derivative of τ (which does not contribute to the superpotential) we have

$$H = -\tau^\kappa d\omega_\kappa + H_{flux} = -\tau^\kappa (p_{\kappa\gamma}\beta^\gamma - q_\kappa^\gamma\alpha_\gamma) + H_{flux}, \quad (24)$$

where we've used $d\omega_i = 0$ and (13). From (11) and (24) we have (using (9)) the result

$$\int \Omega \wedge H = \frac{1}{6\sqrt{8}}(-Z^a\epsilon_a + G_a\mu^a) - (Z^\gamma p_{\kappa\gamma} - G_\gamma(Z)q_\kappa^\gamma)\tau^\kappa.$$

Thus the GTVW superpotential is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W} &= \frac{1}{6\sqrt{8}}(-Z^a\epsilon_a + G_a\mu^a) + i(Z^\gamma p_{\kappa\gamma} - G_\gamma(Z)q_\kappa^\gamma)T^\kappa. \\ &= Z^A P_A - G_A Q^A, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$P_A = (ip_{\kappa\gamma}T^\kappa\delta_A^\gamma - \frac{\epsilon_a}{6\sqrt{8}}\delta_A^a), \quad Q^A = (iq_\kappa^\gamma T^\kappa\delta_\gamma^A - \frac{\mu^a}{6\sqrt{8}}\delta_a^A).$$

Of course with this superpotential the dilaton will not be stabilized. So we need to add a non-perturbative (NP) term coming from gaugino condensation. Typically in the $E_8 \times E_8$ theory the condensing gauge group is taken to be the hidden sector E_8 or a subgroup thereof. Thus the total superpotential is

$$W = \mathcal{W} + ke^{-cS}, \quad (25)$$

where c is a group theoretic number which depends on the gauge group and its matter representations. The pre-factor k is a holomorphic function of the moduli if we take threshold corrections into account. However for the moment let us ignore this and take k to be a constant as is usually done. Let us look at the Kaehler derivatives for the moduli.

$$D_S W = -kce^{-cS} - \frac{1}{S + \bar{S}} W \quad (26)$$

$$D_A W = P_A - G_{AB}Q^B - \frac{\partial_A \tilde{\mathcal{K}}}{\tilde{\mathcal{K}}} W \quad (27)$$

$$D_\kappa W = i(p_{\kappa\gamma}Z^\gamma - G_\gamma q_\kappa^\gamma) - \frac{\partial_\kappa \mathcal{K}}{\mathcal{K}} W \quad (28)$$

$$D_i W = -\frac{\partial_i \mathcal{K}}{\mathcal{K}} W \quad (29)$$

These expressions tell us that there is no supersymmetric solution (i.e. a solution of $D_\Phi W = 0$ for all moduli) if the cohomology group $H^2(\hat{Y})$ is non-trivial. The only way to satisfy the equation $D_{T^i} W = 0$ is to have $t^i \rightarrow \infty$. Note that the option of tuning W to zero is not really

available since if that were the case $S \rightarrow \infty$ i.e. the theory would be at zero coupling. Thus it appears that generalized CY manifolds do not solve Strominger's original problem [12] of finding supersymmetric solutions to the heterotic string in the presence of fluxes unless the manifold has no harmonic two (or four) forms and hence no two (or four) cycles. Thus supersymmetry is necessarily broken as was the case for compactification on CY manifolds. Of course if there are no harmonic two forms, the last equation does not exist and we can have a supersymmetric solution.

We can avoid this conclusion if we include threshold corrections to the classical gauge coupling function S which will result in the prefactor k of the NP term acquiring a dependence on the moduli of the internal manifold [14]. In this case there are extra terms on the RHS of (27)(28) and (29). In particular there would be a term $\partial_{T_i} k e^{-cS}$ on the RHS of (29) so that we may have a supersymmetric solution at finite values of all the Kaehler moduli.

There does not appear to be any obstruction to finding non-supersymmetric minima of the potential with more than one Kaehler modulus. However if k is constant, then the axions corresponding to the moduli which do not appear in W (i.e. the ones corresponding to the harmonic two and four forms), will not be stabilized.

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Andrei Micu for very useful discussions on the contents of this paper and for pointing out that a construction in an earlier version was equivalent to the half-flat case. I also wish to thank Jan Louis for introducing me to the subject, Siye Wu for discussions on the mathematical approach to these manifolds, and the organizers of the CERN string phenomenology institute where this work was started. This research is supported in part by the United States Department of Energy under grant DE-FG02-91-ER-40672.

-
- [1] M. Grana, Phys. Rept. **423**, 91 (2006), hep-th/0509003.
 - [2] M. R. Douglas and S. Kachru (2006), hep-th/0610102.
 - [3] B. de Carlos, S. Gurrieri, A. Lukas, and A. Micu, JHEP **03**, 005 (2006), hep-th/0507173.
 - [4] I. Benmachiche, J. Louis, and D. Martinez-Pedreria, Class. Quant. Grav. **25**, 135006 (2008), 0802.0410.

- [5] G. Lopes Cardoso et al., Nucl. Phys. **B652**, 5 (2003), hep-th/0211118.
- [6] G. Lopes Cardoso, G. Curio, G. Dall’Agata, and D. Lust, Fortsch. Phys. **52**, 483 (2004), hep-th/0310021.
- [7] K. Becker, M. Becker, K. Dasgupta, and P. S. Green, JHEP **04**, 007 (2003), hep-th/0301161.
- [8] K. Becker, M. Becker, P. S. Green, K. Dasgupta, and E. Sharpe, Nucl. Phys. **B678**, 19 (2004), hep-th/0310058.
- [9] S. Gurrieri, A. Lukas, and A. Micu, Phys. Rev. **D70**, 126009 (2004), hep-th/0408121.
- [10] A. R. Frey and M. Lippert, Phys. Rev. **D72**, 126001 (2005), hep-th/0507202.
- [11] M. Grana, J. Louis, and D. Waldram, JHEP **01**, 008 (2006), hep-th/0505264.
- [12] A. Strominger, Nucl. Phys. **B274**, 253 (1986).
- [13] The normalization factor in the equation here is a consequence of taking the convention used in [3].
- [14] These threshold corrections have only been calculated for orbifolds and typically in that case they are proportional to Dedekind η functions of the moduli.